



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

monians and Sicyonians had accompanied them to Corinth. He then concludes: "ceterum μάλλον, *potius*, ad φίλους ποιείσθαι ἐτέρους pertinet; futurum enim esse aiunt ut cogantur alios potius amicos sibi conciliare." The only trouble with this is, that μάλλον is really not accounted for. ἐτέρους τῶν νῦν ὄντων (parallels for ἐτέρους with genitive are given by Stahl, Krüger and others) without μάλλον means 'alios potius quam qui tunc essent.' Morris's note says nothing about μάλλον, but gives references for the genitive depending on ἐτέρους, and explains that τῶν νῦν ὄντων "refers rather to the Lacedaemonians and Sicyonians, who were with them, than to the Illyrians, whom they would hardly call φίλοι." This last, which is also Stahl's opinion, is certainly correct, though not because they would object to calling the Illyrians φίλοι, but because the Corcyraeans wish to imply a threat that they will turn from their natural allies, the Peloponnesians, to the Athenians. And it seems to me that μάλλον helps this meaning and is otherwise useless. "We," they say, "shall be forced to make friends other than (i. e. different from) those who are now more (μάλλον) our friends," i. e. other than the Peloponnesians, who are more our friends by race and nature than are the Athenians, although we are not (31, §2) members of any alliance. The word μάλλον governs φίλων (supplied from the preceding φίλους) ὄντων.

HAROLD N. FOWLER.

NOTES ON ARISTOPHANES' CLOUDS.

- ΜΑΘ. ἐχθὲς δέ γ' ἡμῖν δεῖπνον οὐκ ἦν ἐσπέρας.
 ΣΤΡ. εἰεν· τί οὖν πρὸς τᾷλφιτ' ἐπαλαμῆσατο;
 ΜΑΘ. κατὰ τῆς τραπέζης καταπάσας λεπτὴν τέφραν,
 κάμψας ὀβελίσκον, εἶτα διαβήτην λαβὼν—
 ἐκ τῆς παλαιστρας θυμάτιον ὑφείλετο.
 ΣΤΡ. τί δῆτ' ἐκείνον τὸν Θαλῆν θανμάζομεν;

—VV. 175-180.

G. Hermann first brought a measure of sense into this passage by his happy conjecture of θυμάτιον in line 179 for θοιμάτιον of the MSS, noting the sacrifice alluded to in Plato, *Lysis* 206 E. With θυμάτιον we have actual meat, and so we may put aside the scholia and the numberless interpretations founded on the MSS reading. Blaydes, indeed, reverts to θοιμάτιον (1890, *θυμ.* 1886), but with

no fresh light or persuasiveness. Teuffel-Kähler (1887), after Thiersch, exchanges *τραπέζης*, 177, and *παλαίστρας*, 179: which is plausible enough from his point of view, but fatally perverse, if the explanation to be given is correct. Kock (4th ed., 1894) suspects a lacuna after 178, and views the passage as still far from clear.

From the general character of the scene, 143 on, we are led to expect here a climax of wit—on the one hand a broad caricature of the scientist, on the other some absurd imposition on the simplicity of Strepsiades. Socrates standing near the altar in the palaestra and mesmerizing his pupils, and of course any altar attendant and all loiterers, over a mathematical demonstration, while he slips aside and secures some meat, is an explanation tolerable only in case no better can be found. As a humorous invention it does not strike our imagination as either brilliant or practicable.

A proper understanding of this passage has been obscured, I think, by two misconceptions—first, of the scene, and, secondly, of the *modus operandi*. The scene is the *school* itself,¹ to which the stage Socrates and his pupils are narrowly confined. They do not take walks abroad (198–9). The audience must assume the school as the scene, for the palaestra is not mentioned till the end. The method is *sorcery*. Socrates of the play stands for every sort of sophist and theosophist, physicist, charlatan and wizard.² See the list, lines 331–3. Belief in witchcraft was universal. Strepsiades goes to the school strong in the belief that the Black Art is practised and taught there. At 189 he bids the absorbed pupils not to expend psychic force on locating truffles, for he as a countryman has practical knowledge where to dig for them; but at 215 in terror he bids them conjure Sparta further away on the map. *φροντίζειν* he takes for the technical term. Power to move things through space is the familiar mark of the sorcerer. Strepsiades is constantly, though vainly, seeking a sign. In despair at 749 he proposes to buy a Thessalian witch, whose power was proverbial.

¹ Reisig emphasizes this, Nub. praef., p. 24, and Fritzsche approves, *Adversaria*, I, p. 7. Süvern conceives Socrates as suddenly (l. 178) leaving the school and his absorbed pupils to 'filch the cloak'—Ueber Aristoph. *Wolken*, p. 22, Eng. tr.

² "Comme le Démon de l'Écriture, le Socrate des Nuées s'appelle Légion." Saint Victor, *Les Deux Masques*.

Turning to the passage, 133-80, we see that the underlying motive of the whole is a lampoon upon the scientists. In form, however, we have an older pupil playing upon the verdancy of the newcomer, telling him big stories, lies, not necessarily to be taken as true or possible by the audience, but suited to the credulity and the mental attitude of Strepsiades. To fix attention and facilitate ready apprehension, the comedian introduces each jest by a statement of topic, then an eager question from Strepsiades, and follows it by some comment iterating and emphasizing the point of the jest, e. g. lines 169-70, 174. The bucolic flavor of this last sally puts Strepsiades in great good humor. He catches eagerly at the new problem. *ἐπαλαμίσσας* becomes a cue word, suggesting legerdemain. The recourse is to magic, mathematical magic, practical geodesy, the distance-taking of the famous geometer Thales extended to taking things from a distance. The skewer is used, doubtless, on account of its strong natural affinity for meat. For 'occult sympathies' and magic generally, Lucian's Philopseudes has much in point. In art Urania holds the compasses. *ὑφαίρειν* was a mathematical term, with good punning possibilities, 'subtract,' 'abstract.'

To translate:

- PUPIL. 'Last night at supper-time we had no food.
STREPS. I see. Now tell me quick his trick for bread.
P. Upon the table some fine dust he spread,
Next bent a skewer, made dividers neat—

[No lacuna, but a solemn pause; a few silent gestures, twirling the imaginary compasses, drawing lines, taking directions, and finally pointing off through the air—triumphantly.]

- From the *Palaestra* he deduced our meat.
S. 'Tis wonderful! Old Thales is outdone.'

The allusion to Thales now gets a better point. He is apostrophized not as the wise man, but as the geometer who calculated eclipses and in the popular belief taught the Egyptians how to take the height of their pyramids (Plutarch, *Conv. S. Sap.* 2). It is as if an American should appeal to Ben Franklin not as Poor Richard, but in his great act, *eripuit fulmen caelo*.

Readers have always lacked the significant gestures which made this scene plain to the spectators, and then the early itacistic corruption of *θυμάτιον* turned all astray. Surely we now get for the passage a better sense; that is, a funnier, more intelligible nonsense.

Line 73. Felton alone among editors makes the wife subject of *ἐπιθερο*. This view deserves fuller consideration.

The son is dropped at line 40. The passage following runs upon the mother's ways and influence. There is no syntactical reason for returning to the son before line 77, where the deictic pronoun is used to re-introduce him. It becomes, then, a question of humorous intent.

The son imbibes a passion for horses with his mother's milk. She inserts 'horse' in the name; teaches the baby to 'ride a cock-horse,' and prattles of future horses and chariots and parades. She treats with silent contempt Strepsiades' counter-prophecy with its indirect rebuke, sample of many another (cf. 54-5),

'To this and all I said she gave no heed,
But with horse-fever infected all I own.'

The taint was congenital. The mother is responsible.

Line 1474. Dindorf, Meineke, Kock, Blaydes, reject this line, as the insertion of some one who imagined from *τουτοῦ* the presence of an earthen jar (*δῖνος*). Kock is very positive, and further, with Meineke, reads *τουτοῦ*, i. e. Socrates, which is metrically undesirable; and in the absence of Socrates 'that man's Dinos' is no improvement on 'that Dinos.' Teuffel-Kähler retains the line, but denies the *presence* of the jar.

If there be no jar, the punning allusion is certainly hard to defend. Yet *τουτοῦ* seems hardly to furnish an adequate motive for composing a line and inserting it in the text. Moreover, there are no further difficulties, if the presence of a jar can be justified.

The scholiast misleads us by suggesting a jar, as a figure of Dinos, in the school of Socrates. This is properly recognized as every way improbable. Besides, Strepsiades at 1473 is still before his own door. Now, Strepsiades has statues in his own house—one of Poseidon (83), one of Hermes at his house-gate (1478; cf. Thucyd. VI 27), and perhaps also one of Zeus (1234). We are by no means to suppose with the scholiast on 381 that Strepsiades really confounds the new divinity with a jar. But no commentator seems to have discerned what 'a very excellent, good-conceited thing' it is to make STREPSIADES, thoroughly disabused of his faith in the old gods, in the final act (1131 on) show pedestaled at his house-gate no longer a Zeus or a Hermes, but a big earthen *δῖνος*—as his best attempt to figure forth the new cosmic deity 'Volution' 'in the marble undecaying,' not his

god, but a statue of his god. Fancy the spectators' delight at this pun in statuary. The invention is Strepsiades' own: Socrates has nothing to do with it.

At 1472 Strepsiades undergoes a revulsion of feeling; catching sight of his *Δίος* statue, he smashes it into bits (1473-4), re-erects his prostrate Hermes, and before it bends the knee in prayer (1478 ff.).

Such a piece of scenic cartooning is quite in Aristophanes' manner. Is it not what the spectator saw?

PRINCETON.

S. R. WINANS.

SOME PLACES IN THE PHILOBIBLON OF RICHARD DE BURY.

I.

Ac dum forum suffertur a laico, a librorum alumno clerico mors differtur.—Cap. IV.

Forum suffertur is the reading supplied by the best manuscript of Philobiblon (Royal 8. F. XIV in the British Museum), against *forum transfertur* in the other copies. The correctness of *suffertur* is so evident as to need no special argument, inasmuch as the whole point of the sentence and context is the contrast between the scholar, or 'clerk,' who could prove 'his clergy' by reading some verse from the Psalter, thus saving his neck, and the layman who endured sentence of the civil court. I have had trouble, however, in finding expressions illustrating the phrase *forum suffertur*. Still, here is one which serves admirably to explain it by a converse form, *forum declinare*. It occurs in a sentence of Odofred of Bologna (died 1265), who antedates Richard de Bury by nearly a century. The passage is preserved in Sarti (*De claris Archigymnasii Professoribus, Bononiae*, 1769, I 94, note *b*), and reads:

Vidi hoc in civitate ista (= Bononia) tempore domini Azonis, quod scholares poterant declinare forum in causa criminali, et erant hic tunc temporis X milia scholares.

II.

Omnis artifex manualis hyperduliam propriam suis exhibet instrumentis.—Cap. IV.

De Bury, arguing from the reverence a true artisan feels for the tools of his craft, concludes the clergy should feel likewise toward